THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. May 28, 1943 Iyar 23, 5703 No. 8

EDITORIALS
- *The United States and the Arab World*
- *A Proposed Addition to the Conference Agenda*
- *Raising the Ban on Orientals*

GOVERNMENT IN EXILE
By Leo Trepp

DIASPORA vs. EXILE
By Emanuel Gamoran

BOOK NOTES *By Eugene Kohn*

REALITIES AND VALUES

CORRESPONDENCE

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

RECONSTRUCTIONIST LITERATURE OFFERED BY THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION:

BOOKS

JUDAISM AS A CIVILIZATION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan, the basic text of the Reconstructionist philosophy. (Out of print.)

JUDAISM IN TRANSITION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan $1.50

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan 2.75

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST PAPERS, ed. by M. M. Kaplan, a selection of articles and editorials from *The Reconstructionist* 2.00

THE FUTURE OF JUDAISM IN AMERICA, by Eugene Kohn 1.25

THE MAKING OF THE MODERN JEW, by Milton Steinberg 2.50

CREATIVE JUDAISM, by Ira Eisenstein, a popular presentation of *Judaism As A Civilization* 1.25

WHAT WE MEAN BY RELIGION, by Ira Eisenstein, a popular presentation of *The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion* 1.25

JUDAISM IN A CHANGING CIVILIZATION, by Samuel Dinin 1.25

SHIR HADASH, Supplementary Readings and Prayers for the High Holidays, edited by Eugene Kohn ..... .50

THE NEW HAGGADAH, edited by Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein ..... .75

PAMPHLETS

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST PLATFORM.

TO BE OF NOT TO BE A JEW, by Milton Steinberg.

TOWARD A GUIDE FOR JEWISH RITUAL USAGE.

THE RECONSTRCTIONIST VIEWPOINT, by Mordeclai M. Kaplan.

THE MEANING OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM, by Mordecai M. Kaplan.

ZIONISM—(two articles)

Zionism and the New Opposition, *by Milton Steinberg.*
Reconstructionism and Zionism, *by Ira Eisenstein.*

Do you want to be placed on our mailing list to receive a copy of STUDY AIDS?

STUDY AIDS is prepared in connection with each issue of the magazine, and mailed to you bi-weekly. The contents include:

Questions, references and topics for discussion based on one editorial and one article in the current issue. These aids are intended as a guide for use in adult study groups, and are available without cost for this purpose.

To obtain Reconstructionist literature, or further information regarding the Jewish Reconstructionist Movement, apply to

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION
15 West Eighty-Sixth Street, New York.
Telephone: SChuyler 4-7000

THE
Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. May 28, 1943 Iyar 23, 5703 No. 8

EDITORIALS

THE UNITED STATES AND THE ARAB WORLD

THE Government of the United States is apparently getting ready to sell the Jewish people down the river, as far as Palestine is concerned. This is a serious charge, but there are disquieting signs pointing in that direction. At the National Conference for Palestine held recently in Philadephia, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, in an outspoken and realistic appraisal of Zionism's deteriorated political position, cited several examples of a conspiracy of silence on the part of government officials regarding Zionism. A prominent Cabinet member, who has spoken often and eloquently on Zionism, twice addressed important Zionist meetings in recent months, and completely ignored Zionism. The President of the United States, who has often spoken of Zionist work in Palestine with sympathy, omitted pointedly any mention of Palestine in his 1943 official greeting to the United Jewish Appeal. Right down the line, government officials who were entirely sympathetic with Zionist aims in Palestine now completely avoid the subject and content themselves with expressions of sympathy for Jewish persecution. Judging by the political policy of this country in North Africa and Spain, this silence is indeed ominous. Appeasement of fascist and semi-fascist forces is not dead!

In the light of the above, the series of articles by C. L. Sulzberger on the Near East, which has appeared in recent weeks in the *New York Times,* takes on added significance. C. L. Sulzberger, a chip off the old block, reports that the Middle East fears a Zionist-dominated Palestine in the post-war era; that the lack of an official United States policy is harmful to Allied interests, and gives the OWI a difficult role to play in winning over the Arab world to the cause of the United Nations. Poor OWI! Maybe the Americans *are* innocent babes in the political wood! Or maybe the fact that the Damascus office of the OWI alone has but eight Americans and thirty natives accounts for this undue concern over the fate of the Arabs.

We maintain that this bogie of Arab fear of a Zionist-dominated Palestine is largely the creation of C. L. Sulzberger's mind and of the OWI itself. The same *New York Times* has been printing a series of articles by its military editor, Hanson W. Baldwin, who has just returned from a 22,000-mile trip by sea, air and land to North Africa and Britain. In his article of May 15, he has the following to say with regard to the Arabs in

North Africa: "There is no unified Pan-Arab movement of much consequence in North Africa. Arab leaders in Morocco and Algeria are generally pro-Ally; those in Tunisia are mixed in their sympathies. . . . The Arab problem in North Africa has been over-emphasized; the Arabs live in a feudal world much as they did a thousand years ago. They are depressed, disease-ridden, poor, decadent. Though our propaganda has left many of the North Africa Arabs cold, Axis propaganda has not knit them into any unified force. . . . The Arab-Jewish problem has been a problem in North Africa for centuries, but it was exacerbated recently by the Vichy anti-Semitic laws. . . . The indigenous Jew and the indigenous Arab had settled their respective places in North Africa decades ago; they got along relatively well together; the abrogation of the discriminatory legislation imposed by Vichy since the fall of France—something that has now been done—should remove many of the artificially imposed causes of friction."

With exceptions here and there, much the same thing can be said of the Arab problem and of Arab-Jewish relations in the Near East. What Arab problem there is has been over-emphasized; indeed it has been intentionally stirred up by the deliberate and stupid meddling of England and the United States. What has the Arab world done to help the cause of the United Nations? What is there to fear from the Arab world? The Arabs are and will be on the side of the victors; there is no need to have any fears about their allegiance to our cause. Why this appeasement of the Arab world?

The oppressed peoples of Europe, waiting and hoping for deliverance, have been dismayed by our hand outstretched in friendliness to Franco and by our espousal of the cause of Vichy appeasers in North Africa. In our rejoicing over the overwhelming victory of our forces in Tunisia, let us not overlook or forget the dangerous and contradictory policy of our State Department in Spain, in North Africa, in the Near East. Such a policy can only lead to the betrayal of the Jewish people in Palestine. We must not let the Zionist cause be sacrificed on the altar of appeasement!

A PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE CONFERENCE AGENDA

THE forthcoming American Jewish Conference is, without question, the most important item on the agenda of American Jewry at this moment. It is, therefore, gratifying to see that interest in elections has begun to grow. National organizations and local bodies are already busily engaged in the process of mobilizing their forces to choose those representatives who will best express the viewpoints of the constituencies. In the meantime, the roster of participating organizations is being rounded out. The Jewish Labor Committee has now voted to join the Conference. The stage is set for historic events.

The question that arises, even before the deliberations of the Conference begin, is: Will the Conference be able to stay within the framework of its present agenda? And must not thought be given to the need for interpreting that framework broadly? That is to say, will the Conference be able, for example, to discuss the future of Jews in Palestine and on the European scene without, at the same time, involving itself deeply in a consideration of the whole problem of the status of the Jewish group in the world? Some clarification will have to be given to the problem: What kind of group are the Jews anyway? And if that problem comes up, it will be impossible to dissociate the Jews of America from the discussion. It may be true that the Conference is not expected to deal with

problems of American Jewry; but that expectation will be hard to live up to.

We believe that, before discussions have gone to any considerable length, it will become apparent that world Jewry is indivisible, that the "Jewish problem" is one problem, that Jewish isolationism is as fallacious a doctrine as any other type of isolationism. And since that is the case, American Jewry must see its destiny intertwined with the destiny of world Jewry. If this thesis is clearly understood at the outset, the Conference will not make the mistake of straining to avoid discussion of some of our own American-Jewish problems.

The major concern in any such discussion will undoubtedly be anti-Semitism. The anti-Semite, we now all recognize, is not only a diseased person; he is a carrier. He breeds hate and dissension; he eventually spreads vicious propaganda against all groups who stand for liberalism; he sabotages the war. The anti-Semite is a menace to democracy. It should therefore be the purpose of the American Jewish Conference to make clear to Jews and to non-Jews alike that the abolition of anti-Semitism is one of the first and most necessary steps to be taken in setting up a decent post-war world, in which the Jew also can live. *"Anti-Semitism should be outlawed!"* This is the demand which the Conference should place before the United Nations.

The outlawing of anti-Semitism is not a new phenomenon in European countries, and today many groups in England are advocating such a move.

That anti-Semitism should be made an offense against the state has been proposed before in this country too. But such proposals came at a time when we still had peculiar notions of tolerance. We were then so liberal that we not only allowed the anti-Semites the right to hate and to publish their hate, but we allowed Germany to kill and to conquer with impunity. To be sure, even today, there are some who insist that Americans should have the right to indulge prejudices and to express, without control, their bigoted ideas of races and religions. But most Americans should by now have learned that freedom cannot be granted to those who seek to destroy it for others, and anti-Semitism is precisely that movement which seeks the freedom to agitate for the denial of freedom—even of life—to the Jews.

The American Jewish Conference will not be able to avoid this fundamental issue, and we call upon all prospective representatives to the Conference to be prepared to extend the frame of reference to include consideration of such questions. We call upon them also to ponder carefully the proposal we make: to work out a way of guaranteeing the world and the Jews protection from the anti-Semites by incorporating into the laws of the lands the kind of legislation which shall brand them forever as enemies of society.

EASING THE BAN ON ORIENTALS

ONE of the interesting items to come out of the Annual Congregational Conference of Oregon held in Portland, Oregon, early this month was the endorsement of a movement to put all Orientals on an immigration quota basis "like that by which Europeans are admitted."

Admission of immigrants to this country is governed by the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended by the Immigration Act of 1929 (sometimes known as the "Quota Law"). Under these regulations 153,900 aliens may be admitted to this country every year. This number is apportioned on the basis of two percent of each nationality that were residents of this country as evidenced by the U. S. Census of 1890.

In 1882, Congress passed the Chinese

(*Continued on Page* 20)

THE
Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues starting in Oct., by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 15 W. 86th St., New York, N. Y. Subscription: $1.00 per year; 10c. per copy; foreign, 25c. extra. Membership in Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to The Reconstructionist. Entered as second class matter Jan. 9, 1935, at Post Office, New York, N. Y., under act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: Mordecai M. Kaplan.
Associate Chairman: Ira Eisenstein.
Managing Editor: Eugene Kohn.
Associate Editors: Shlomo Bardin, Asher Block, Israel S. Chipkin, Samuel Dinin, Abraham G. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Solomon Goldman, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Milton Steinberg.
Contributing Editors: Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben Zion Bokser, William I. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Jacob S. Golub, Robert Gordis, Emanuel Green, Max Kadushin, Joshua Loth Liebman, I. D. Minzberg, Edward T. Sandrow, Simon Shetzer, Joshua Trachtenberg, Jacob J. Weinstein.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC Relations recently issued a volume of "Jewish Population Studies." The results, based on surveys in a limited number of cities, indicate that Jewish families are getting smaller—smaller, in fact, than other American families—and that, although three out of four children go to High School, fewer than half are to be found, at any one time, in any kind of Jewish educational institution. If ever we needed proof that Jews have begun to lose the will to live as Jews, this is it. Jewish men and women bring a child or two into the world to satisfy their hunger for parenthood; but they rarely believe sufficiently in the chances of being happy as Jews to raise more children. And the pitifully few they produce they "protect" from Jewish education. The picture is tragic to those who are trying to build a better world and a revived and rejuvenated Israel. Racial and cultural suicide are the end product of the process of disintegration. If the Jewish people is to be prevented from committing racial and cultural suicide, there is no time to be wasted; the Reconstructionists must strive to rekindle Jewish hope and faith.

▼

IF JEWS ARE REALLY SINCERE about their protestations of sympathy with the Negro, they will not hesitate to translate them into action. The Marcantonio Bill, H.R. 7, seeks to eliminate poll-tax laws in those states which still tolerate them. The poll-taxes discriminate also against the poor Whites; but the main brunt is borne by the Negroes. The Commission on Law and Legislation of the American Jewish Congress has circulated an appeal that letters be written to Congressmen urging support of the bill. We concur in the purpose of the American Jewish Congress and urge our readers to communicate with their representatives.

▼

A COMMITTEE IN NEW YORK is being formed to protest against the "exclusion" from the American Jewish Conference of "left-wing and progressive" elements in the Jewish community. Let no Jews be fooled by such a protest. The Conference cannot possibly represent all American Jews; it can and will represent all those Jews in America who have enough interest in Judaism and the Jewish people to join an organization de-

voted to Jewish purposes. It is infuriating—and it would be funny if it were not—to listen to some of our left-wing friends who, for years, did everything in their power to liquidate Jewish communal life, now angrily insisting upon their right to a voice. They may have formed "Jewish" organizations, but the organizations were Jewish in the racial sense only. They have never had, and they do not now have, any interest in Jewish cultural or religious life, and their organizations have not been devoted to the advancement of Jewish causes. The Conference leaders should not be swayed by their protests.

▼

THE PARTICIPATION OF JEWISH Palestine in the war effort has not been rewarded by a recognition of the right of Jews to fight as a unit in the armies of the United Nations nor by any assurance of respect for the right of the Jewish people to make Palestine their national home. But it has apparently won a place for the Hebrew language as a "war subject" in the curriculum of the public high schools of New York. On the occasion of the Golden "Ayin" Festival, when a gold pin with the Hebrew letter *ayin,* standing for *Ivrith,* was presented to students who had distinguished themselves in the Hebrew courses of the high schools, Mayor LaGuardia addressed a letter to the chairman of the celebration. He said in part: "Your Festival coincides with 'I am an American' Day. We are fortunate that we live in a land which considers the human personality sacred and cherishes the varied culture of the human spirit as expressed by the many groups that compose America. . . .I take pride in the fact that our Board of Education, acting in the spirit of true Americanism, has instituted the teaching of modern Hebrew on a par with other languages. . . . It has recently taken cognizance of the practical importance of the Hebrew language in the Near East in connection with the war effort of the United Nations, and has recognized it as a war subject. Recognition has thus been given also to the growing Jewish community in Palestine where the ancient Hebrew has been revived as a living modern language."

▼

AT THE INSTANCE OF THE National Conference of Christians and Jews, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish Commissions have been at work for a number of years on a revision of religious text-books, with a view to removing passages that are derogatory of other faiths and likely to produce ill-will between them. These Commissions have published a report on the work accomplished, and Dr. Bernard Heller, acting as the consultant of the Synagogue Council Textbook Commission, has prepared an analysis and evaluation of the work accomplished. His report, which has been published by the Synagogue Council, is a fair analysis of the results achieved. He finds the results encouraging and regards what has been accomplished as an important step towards a desired goal. But he is candid enough to point out certain inadequacies that still remain. We are particularly interested in his critique of the efforts of the Jewish Commission. That body saw fit to seek "the elimination, substitution, annotation or modification of . . . texts" that describe the suffering of the Jews as a consequence of intolerant, oppressive and violent treatment at the hands of Christians. Dr. Heller's comment is that "this procedure of deliberately omitting to recount lamentable Jewish experiences at the hands of Christians is as unsatisfactory as is the silence of the Catholics about the Crucifixion. A condition is rectified not by shunting facts but by explaining them fully and honestly." All who are actively interested in promoting better inter-faith relations should study the reports of the

(*Continued on Page* 20)

Government in Exile

By LEO TREPP*

THE conquest of great parts of Europe by Hitler's armies has led to the establishment of governments in exile. It is the first time in history that nations who have lost the sovereignty over their soil are being recognized by others and go on existing as political units. This is a significant change. Taken as an indication of a new spirit, it holds the promise of a new and better order in the world.

The Nations and Their Soil

Franz Rosenzweig has outlined the relationship between the peoples and their soil in these words: "The nations of the world cast their roots in the night of the earth, which is dead and yet gives life. In it, the eternal one, they see the guarantee, that they too will endure. Their will to survive is thus linked to the soil, their hope of survival to their power over the soil; for it, the blood of their sons is shed. Thus the soil provides subsistence, but chains the peoples to itself. Since they love the soil of their homelands more than their own lives, the nations are constantly facing grave dangers. Nine times out of ten this love may rescue the soil from the hands of the enemy, but the tenth time the soil may be the greater love and the nation may die on it. Thus the one who conquers the soil finally will have the people. The soil may betray the people who entrusted their future to the land on which they lived. The land remains, but the people on it perishes!"

In fact, the nations of the earth have at all times derived their strength from contact with their soil. The Greek myth of the giant who gained new energies whenever he touched the ground, shows the awareness of this fact even among the peoples of antiquity. The land was the uniting and sustaining force, moulding families and tribes into nations; without it, they were unable to survive.

The soil was the master of the peoples, and thus the master of the soil possessed the people too. This simplified the problems of war. Conquerors knew that their only problem was to take the land and add it to their possessions. The defenders equally realized that defeat did not merely involve the loss of sovereignty, but also the loss of identity. In order to survive as nations, they had to risk their lives as individuals, even in cases in which the transfer of their country did not endanger their individual future.

The constant dread of war thus hung over the head of every nation. But, by the same token, the advocates of new ideas came to believe that the only way to spread new teachings, the only way to promote progress, was by war. They felt that they had to own the soil in order to win souls. Thus they set out on "Crusades" and "Holy Wars." And since ideas are bound to develop constantly, war came to be regarded as a permanent institution.

Thinking Along New Lines: America and the Peace of Versailles

Thus, in the Old World, tyrants and idealists for centuries resorted to war as the only means of making history. In the New World, however, a change of attitude began to develop, almost unnoticed. The vast soil of the American continent, especially North America, became accessible to great numbers of immigrants from all parts of the earth. Many came in order to be free to pursue their ideals, a freedom denied them by the sovereigns of the soil on which they

* Rabbi, Springfield, Mass.

had been raised. They were transferring ideas; but, for the first time, this transfer was a peaceful one. True, the soil of their new homeland transformed them into one nation. They surrendered their identity and yet they kept it. They remained different in spirit and yet became one. And the new nation adopted the best each group had to offer and made it the common property of all.

The Peace of Versailles presented a similar opportunity to the European nations. The preceeding war had brought various nations together. All of them had contributed ideas as well as men. They all had been fighting for a free world, just as the American settlers had been toiling for a free America. The main obstacle in Europe had been removed, since the imperialistic and militaristic nations had been defeated. And yet, the opportunity was not recognized. The peace was still based on the assumption that a nation had to have full sovereignty over its soil in order to develop its national soul and to make a contribution to humanity. This led to sorry consequences. It sliced Europe up in a way which brought about grave economic difficulties. It sealed the doom of the League of Nations from the very outset.

Governments in Exile and the New Europe

We should like to see, in the creation and recognition of governments in exile, an indication that a change of spirit is on its way in Europe at the present time. It may mean that the nations and their rulers have realized that peoples can go on living even without exercising full sovereignty over their soil. They may have learned by now that it was a mistake to preserve national sovereignty to the point where it defeated its own purpose. The nations may have found out that the spirit of cooperation rather than the spirit of seclusion makes for survival. They have all been willing to give up some part of their sovereignty for the sake of the common cause. Even Britain has done so, and the concession made to the United States in giving it jurisdiction over the American Expeditionary Force on British soil becomes significant in this connection. Above all, they have learned to discard the old theory which regarded sovereignty over land as the prerequisite for the recognition of any national entity. Those nations which have lost this sovereignty are no longer regarded as extinct; they continue making history and their contribution is recognized. This idea logically should evolve into the recognition of those nations as well which have lost the soil itself but, while living in exile, have qualified for nationhood by their national spirit. The nation which would then be the most affected would be the Jewish people.

If this conception can gain a firm hold in the minds of the nations concerned, it may lead to a new understanding of the functions of government. Government will then be concerned not merely with the problems arising out of the sovereignty over the soil, but with those arising from the soul of the people. The material foundation of government will be replaced by the ethical foundation. It will be recognized that political government without spiritual foundations will not be able to provide true leadership, since government will have to promote the spiritual strength which alone can safeguard survival.

This, however, means that the principles for which religion stands will have to replace the political principles of sovereignty whenever these two enter into conflict.

That these points of conflict exist cannot be denied. To the political form of thinking the nation is its own supreme authority and its own supreme judge. Its

mere existence justifies its survival. It thus constitutes merely a body, its only task being to exist. It is individualistic and, in fact, "without sin" (although the individual citizens are not). Those principles of course cannot be upheld without sovereignty over the soil.

The religious principle as a basic form of thinking would make the nation subject to humanity and responsible to it. It would conceive the nation as having a destiny and a soul, and the nation would have to account for itself in the light of the spirit. By thus making it conscious of "sin," this conception would lift the nation from the sphere of isolationism into the sphere of universalistic responsibilities. These principles can be upheld also by nations without soil.

The Jewish People and the Principle of Its Survival

This conception, however, is not altogether new. The prophet Zechariah advises the people who are about to restore their state after the Babylonian exile to build their nation on the religious principle rather than on the political principle. ("Not by might nor by power but by my spirit"). How right he was has been shown by history. For the last two thousand years the Jewish people has existed without any soil, without sovereignty, merely by the strength of its spiritual foundation.

Israel was held together by its constitution: the Torah. The Torah gave the people its distinction; it taught that the strength to survive is not bound up with "bread alone," with the soil and its most distinguished product, but is derived from the word "which cometh out of the mouth of God." Being broad enough to permit the nation in exile communion with the civilizations in which it had to live, the Torah promoted cooperation and yet protected the people from being dissolved in an overwhelming majority.

The Reward of Education

Israel learned this truth long before it had to apply it in its own national life. Zechariah was merely addressing the leaders; the masses, however, were educated by means of their own historical tradition. The historians of Israel were not so much concerned with accurate facts but with the moral they wanted to teach and around which they arranged their facts, permitting themselves considerable liberty at times in order to make history serve their educational purposes.

Thus Israel heard of Abraham. Had he not been an emigrant when he conceived the principle of Israel's life and the fundament of its constitution: the one God? Had not their first government been a government in exile, in Egypt—as their historians told them? Was it not there that, contrary to all theories of nationalism, the people had become united? Was not the desert the place where they adopted their constitution?

And the lawgiver, furthermore, took good care that this principle should not be forgotten during the years of Israel's life as a sovereign, land-owning nation. One example may suffice. In the moment of his greatest pride in his soil, when the farmer brought his first fruits to the Temple, he had to affirm it. He professed: "My father was a nomad, he went to Egypt, and *there* he became a nation, and the Lord has brought us (the nation) into this place and has given us this land."

The land belongs to the nation, but the nation is not chained to the soil. This explains the "defeatist" utterances of the prophets on many occasions, and the action of a Johanan ben Zakkai, who "sells out" Jerusalem for the academy in Javneh. What he does is merely to exchange the political capital for the spiritual capital. And this explains the reac-

tions of the Jewish people throughout the ages, which saw in these men not traitors but national heroes.

The Midrash has condensed the whole idea in one sentence: Wherever Israel goes into exile, God's Shekinah, the spirit of his glory, goes with them. "God is the essence of Israel's national spirit. It is his "government in exile" which safeguards Jewish survival.

Thus Israel was able to transform even the messianic idea. The Messiah is not merely the restorer of Israel's sovereign power, he is at the same time a suffering Messiah. This means again, that he is the symbol of "government in exile," ruling through the spirit of the nation and being most powerful in times of suffering.

Following these principles the Jewish people refused to stake its life on the land. But while we affirm the futility of wars and see in the spirit of the nation the only lasting guarantee for survival, this does not mean that we refuse to fight. Israel fought heroically for its land; but when it lost the war, it did not give itself up.

For the fight against the enemy of the spirit is sanctioned in the Constitution, the Torah itself. It has its symbol in the fight against Amalek, which is regarded as a perennial task. As a fight for a principle, it has to lead to the complete destruction of the enemy; "forget it not." The Jewish people thus will wholeheartedly participate in any war waged against the enemies of the spirit.

The Implication for the Present War

The implication for our present struggle, which is, more than any previous war, a fight for the spirit against an unholy alliance of soil-hungry nations, is clear.

It means for us, that the ideas for which we have fought throughout the centuries are being put to the test. We are fully in it. The example of governments in exile shows that the nations seem to be following fundamental ideas which were put forward by the Jewish people. Of course, they do so unconsciously. The Constitution and history of our people contains all the fundamental ideas upon which the policies of war and of peace could be based.

The recognition of nations without a country affects us deeply. It gives us a chance of getting full recognition for our homeland and for the Jews as a people.

The Homeland in Palestine

The fact that we were able to survive without a homeland does not mean that we do not need one. But it gives us a relationship to the soil, which is similar to that of the farmer in the times of the Temple. Palestine was upheld by the spirit of the nation during its life in exile. Zionism would never have been possible without the spiritual values which Eretz Yisrael embodies for our people and the attachment which grew out of the spiritual idea of Zion. The soil of Palestine was thus redeemed by the spirit of the nation, whereas usually nations are restored to life by their soil. Palestine, too, has restorative powers, but never as mere dead earth. The establishment of political sovereignty cannot be our only aim. Palestine will always remain "aim and task," as Martin Buber once termed it. It will always be the land "upon which God's eyes rest." This means that Palestine will always be upheld by the spirit of the nation, which in turn is upheld by God.

Conclusion

Hermann Cohen once wrote: "In the history of the nations it is not the height of their outward power which protects them from decay. Hope and faith, on one hand, and the strength to endure, on the other hand, are the indications as well as the forces of religious progress. They

indicate a development, which it is the task of religion in history to bring about. The suffering of the Jews in the course of world-history, therefore, is an indication of spiritual and religious progress. It proves the power of the spirit to resist all persecutions and temptations."

At the present time we are not the only ones to suffer, not the only ones to survive by the means of a government in exile. The heroism and the spiritual strength of the peoples who are under Hitler's yoke and the means they have found to survive give us hope that some day the world may follow the ideals for which Israel has endured and is enduring so much. The new conception of the foundations of national life holds the promise that the coming peace may be built on spiritual values and thus may bring lasting harmony between all nations, including Israel.

Diaspora vs. Exile

By EMANUEL GAMORAN

Do Zionists Despair of Democracy?

ONE of the unpleasant features of the present controversy between the Zionists and the anti-Zionists is the frequent assertion that Zionists despair of democracy. The argument usually advanced is as follows: If Zionists had faith in the triumph of democracy and liberalism they would necessarily give up their interest in Zionism. In a democratic world there will be no need for the Jews to have Palestine. The insistence of the Zionists on the importance of upbuilding the Jewish national home is, so the anti-Zionist declares, an indication of their lack of faith in the possibility of a liberal, democratic world.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this charge is entirely unfounded and partakes of the character of giving a dog a bad name and hanging him. In their desire to make a point, anti-Zionists assert, though they know or ought to know better, that they have faith in liberalism while the Zionists lack such faith. Surely, anyone who gives the Jewish problem even a little thought must realize that there is no solution, and there can be no solution to it in a Nazi-Fascist society. Such a society, based on the conception of superior and inferior races, would at once relegate the Jews to an inferior place and make an adequate solution of the ills that afflict the Jewish people impossible, both in Palestine and in the lands of the diaspora. The Zionist, on the contrary, bases his faith on the thought that the democratic forces will triumph and will, once and for all, wipe the kingdoms of wickedness off the face of the earth. In a world in which reconstruction will be undertaken in the spirit of the ideals of freedom, liberalism and democracy, the Jewish people will have an opportunity to be heard by the international authorities seeking to alleviate the suffering of mankind. Our claims to Palestine are thus made not only on the basis of history, but also on the basis of the tragic situation in which the Jews find themselves, on our achievements in Palestine, and on the conviction that any tribunal guided by justice will consider favorably the just demands of the Jewish people.

The Indiscriminate Use of "Galut" or "Golah"

There is, however, one respect in which Zionists serve grist to the anti-Zionist mill, and that is our indiscriminate use of the term *galut* or *golah* to describe all coun-

tries in which Jews live outside of Palestine, including the United States of America. The difficulty of such a position was brought home to me some years ago, when my oldest boy was seven years old, and he and I were reading a Hebrew story. We came across the word *golah* which he had not encountered previously. When he asked the meaning of the word, I explained what exile meant—that when a people is driven from its soil into a strange land, it is in exile. Continuing the explanation, I told him of the destruction of the Temple and of the suffering which thousands of our people endured in the various lands into which they were driven by their enemies. When the explanation was over, the child turned to me and said: "But we are not in exile, are we?" My reply was: "You are quite right, we are not in exile. You were born in this country and in this city, and this is your home. Therefore, you are not in exile."

The inquiry which followed my explanation disturbed me profoundly. For years and years Zionists have become accustomed to speak of Eretz Yisrael and of *golah,* of Palestine and of "The Exile.' Are we justified, however, in using the term *golah* or *galut* in describing Jewish life in the diaspora without making distinctions as to the country concerning which we speak? Is it possible to say to an individual who has never lived in any other land than that in which he was born and is happy in that land, that he is in exile? Can a person who is a happy citizen of a land be considered an exile in that land?

Clarifying the Concept of "Exile"

One thought seems clear—that exile is a concept which has definite negative associations. These associations are based, first, on the conditions under which an individual or a group lives in a given land and, second, on the feeling, on the subjective reaction of the individual to the situation. It might help us at this point to look into a distinction which is made in recent psychological writings. As we know, the entire movement to measure mental functions and attitudes introduced the concept of the quantitative into areas which hitherto we had not been accustomed to class in that category. Normally, it would not occur to anyone to think of justice as other than qualitative. Nevertheless most of us will readily admit that, if to act one way in a given situation is to be considered just and to act in a contrary way unjust, then an individual who, in 95 out of 100 cases will act justly, will be said to be a possessor of justice to a greater degree than one who so acts in only ten cases out of 100. From this point of view, quantity becomes quality. If this is true, the conception of exile, with all its negative associations, may be thought of similarly. If to be subjected to a great many negative conditions, political, civic, economic, and cultural, that are unfavorable is to be in exile, to be subjected to only a minimum of such conditions is to be, so to say, less in exile, and as you get to the zero end of the scale, to be not at all in exile. Similar questions might be asked concerning the opportunities which an individual has for self-expression, for self-realization. What opportunities does he have? What opportunities does he lack? We may take one or two illustrations:

Is anyone justified in making the statement that Justice Brandeis was in exile when he served as Justice of the Supreme Court of the land? Or to say that Lord Reading was in exile when he was the Viceroy of India? Or that Leon Blum was in exile when he was the head of the government of France? Clearly, the concept of exile must be considered a relative one and not an absolute one. One can readily conceive of one of the pioneers in Palestine during the Turkish regime, with all the restrictions it im-

posed on the population, saying, "We are in *galut* in Palestine."

The Problem of Dual Loyalty

In addition to the question of fact concerning the status enjoyed by a citizen of a given land who was either born in that land or became naturalized and accepted his new country as his own, there is also the question of his sense of relationship both to the government and to the people in whose midst he lives. We need not enter into the ridiculous accusations and implications of the extreme anti-Zionists who would like to make every Zionist out to be involved in a dual political allegiance. If their negative emotional conditioning against Palestine did not interfere, they would all see very clearly that political allegiance can only be single, and not dual. A person who becomes the citizen of one country renounces allegiance to all other countries and governments. It is not a question of formal political allegiance that we are considering. It is rather the question of a positive attitude to the culture, to the civilization, of which the individual becomes a part. Can a person living in the United States of America today, mindful of the many noble utterances made by our great President and Vice-President, feel other than a strong desire to identify himself with the spirit and the ideals of an America striving ever to grow more democratic and to bring the blessings of democracy to the entire world? Is there not, under those circumstances, a feeling that one is unethical if one employs such a concept as *galut* when speaking to a child who lives in this country and enjoys the privileges of American citizenship and American democracy? Surely the feeling that we wish to give him—that he is a citizen of the first class, not of the second or third class—tends to be destroyed by the use of any concept or phraseology that would imply that his relationship to the country of his birth is not "whole." It is hardly necessary to point out that the psychological effect on the Jewish child is bound to be negative. The feeling that he is in exile might lead to the development of a sense of inferiority on his part, which, alas, so many adult Jews already have. This is especially undesirable when we know that the great majority of our children will spend the rest of their lives in the United States of America. It is a matter of great importance for us that they should feel themselves integrated into American life and that they should accept their Americanism, as well as their Judaism, as a natural part of a dual heritage

At this point it would seem wise to introduce the thought, well accepted by millions of Americans, that, though a man can be the bearer of only one political allegiance, he can be the bearer of many cultures. Loyalty to one culture, appreciation of it, in no way destroys loyalty to another, unless the culture involves a conflict in point of view, such as between democracy and nazism. One cannot be a good American and a good Nazi. The acceptance of nazism necessarily involves the rejection of Americanism. Otherwise, however, a man's life is enriched if he possesses more than one culture.

Two Solutions

It seems to me, therefore, that there are two solutions to the problem. One is to abandon the concept of *galut,* as applied in all lands which are characterized by freedom and democracy and, on the whole, an attitude of decency to religious or ethnic minorities, and to use instead the concept of diaspora. We should apply the concept of *galut* to those countries outside of Palestine in which Jews are persecuted; countries in which there is relative peace and security should be described by the term *diaspora.* This term is free from all those nega-

tive connotations associated with the phrase "exile" or *"galut."*

There will, of course, be those who will point out that, even under the very best of circumstances, the Jews, as an ethnic or religious group, are a minority and, because they are a minority, are at a disadvantage even in lands of freedom and comparative security. They will point to exclusion from economic opportunity, to the establishment of official or unofficial Jewish quotas in professional schools and in certain universities, and to other evidences of anti-Semitism and undemocratic discrimination. We admit the truth, bitter as it is, and face it. In spite of these disadvantages, it can nevertheless be stated as truth that, for the Jews who have come to this country, America cannot be considered *galut.*

This brings us to the second solution. Perhaps one of the distinctions which we should make is that individuals may make very happy adjustments in the lands of diaspora—it is possible for a Brandeis and a Blum to be happy as individuals—and for the Jewish people as a whole, nevertheless, to be in exile. If so, the concept of *galut* must be applied in the sense of the phrase *"Shekinta begaluta."* ("The Divine Presence is in exile"). This phrase implies that the people as a whole—its spirit, its culture—has no opportunity to enjoy normal development. Whenever such a situation exists, individuals here and there may be happy and well adjusted, but the people as a whole may be considered in exile. From this *galut* of the people we must somehow or other free ourselves. One of the ways of achieving such freedom, and the only way that we have so far discovered, is that of normalizing the people by giving them one place in the world where they themselves will constitute the majority of the population.

Advantages of Distinguishing Between Galut and Diaspora

The employment of the concept of *galut,* in the way it is generally used, without giving consideration to the above distinction, is also responsible, at least in part, for another negative aspect of American Jewish life, and that is the unintentional conveying of an impression that the possibility of a Diaspora Judaism is to be denied. We have always had a party that believed in *"shelilat hagalut"* ("the negation of the *galut"*). I think it is a fact that a great majority of the Jewish people do not negate the diaspora. Unconsciously we may be contributing to the neglect of Jewish education and Jewish cultural institutions on the American scene. What is more, we give opportunity to those who hate Zion and would undermine our effort in Palestine to accuse us of a spurious form of Americanism. We can overcome this difficulty, at least in part, by using the right term to describe the right situation that confronts us. We use the term *diaspora* to describe every country outside of Palestine, just as in Hebrew we use the phrase *"hutz laaretz"* or *"tefutzah."* We reserve the term *galut, or exile,* to describe those countries in which the Jewish people are persecuted, deprived of their political and economic rights, and we recognize that there are degrees in this respect—some countries are better than others. After victory of the United Nations we hope all countries will extend equal rights to all the citizens of the land.

Such a distinction between the concept of *galut* and that of diaspora should also help our teachers in doing more effective work in our schools. They are undoubtedly confronted by problems similar to those which faced the writer when he explained the word *galut* to his own child. Why should a Jewish teacher employ a term which will be misunderstood by the pupils, by our parents, and which will give him,

if he is a loyal Zionist, a bad name. Why contribute to the impression which the anti-Zionists would like to establish, that Zionists regard the American Jew as being in exile. We know that this is untrue. It is our duty to make our relationship both to Palestine and to America clear. We are interested in upbuilding Palestine, in having at least one place on earth where the Jewish people may act as a host in a house of its own. We seek to do this in order to solve, as far as we can, both the problem of the Jew and the problem of Judaism. We recognize, however, the great opportunity that America, with its vision of democracy, affords to the five million Jews that are now living in this country. We share not only in the privilege of political citizenship; we are also participators and, we trust, likewise bearers of the finest in American culture. We want to enrich it, we want to improve it, we want to raise it to higher levels of achievement. And the fact that we are also the bearers of Jewish culture will help us in achieving this end. Teachers, clearly conscious of both these concepts, will undoubtedly contribute to the rearing of a generation of intelligent American Jews, proud of their Jewish heritage, conscious of their dignity, and able to inspire their pupils to a proper understanding of both ideals—the ideal of Zion and the ideal of America.

Book Notes

MEMOIRS OF MY PEOPLE—THROUGH A THOUSAND YEARS, selected and edited by Leo W. Schwartz, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1943.

IN this volume, Leo W. Schwartz, who has already enriched the cultural life of English-reading Jewry by two notable anthologies, *The Jewish Caravan* and *A Golden Treasury of Jewish Literature, again* makes a notable contribution; this time it is an anthology of Jewish memoirs covering the last thousand years of Jewish history.

For the person who wants to know what Jewish life has been like during the last thousand years, not as a chronological sequence of events nor a chain of historic causes and effects, but as experienced by the Jews themselves, no better source could be found than this fascinating anthology. Here one finds a record of the habits, interests, thoughts and emotions, frustrations and achievements, of no less than fifty-eight typical personalities. Among them are to be found such famous men as Moses Maimonides, Isaac Abravanel, Solomon Molko and, in modern times, Ahad Ha-am, Theodor Herzl, George Brandes. But there are also to be found among them obscure people who, in their day, laid no claim to fame and who might easily have been forgotten were it not for their having answered an inner urge to record the events or circumstances of their lives—Gluckel of Hameln, a plain Jewish housewife; Daniel Mendoza, the pugilist; Marcos Alperson, a refugee from Russian persecution, who was among the Jewish colonists of Argentine, and many more.

What a variety of types one finds here!—rich and poor, learned and ignorant, rationalists and mystics, saints and sinners,

loyalists and apostates, serene souls and souls torn by inner conflict, conformists and rebels, philosophers, artists, social revolutionaries, and the sort of persons whom Lincoln called "plain people." And they are all Jews. In one form or another the fact that they belong to the Jewish people conditions their thinking and feeling, whether they react to their Jewish heritage with faith and enthusiasm, with objective criticism, or with devastating skepticism and revolt.

All the vicissitudes of Jewish life and the movements within Jewry in response to them are reflected in the pages of this book. Marranoism and the attempt to escape from marrano status, the messianic movements initiated by Reubeni and Molco and later by Shabbatai Zevi, the Italian ghetto and the Russian pale, Jewish involvement in the bourgeois revolution against feudalism and in the socialist revolution against capitalism, medieval scholasticism and medieval mysticism, modern Haskalah and Hasidism, assimilationism, Reform, Zionism, migration and colonization—all of them are represented.

What influence, if any, is such a book likely to have that would justify the labor expended upon it by the editor? To Gentile readers—and we should like it to have a wide reading public among Gentiles as well as Jews—it reveals the facts that Jews are persons, not just a race or a type. This is important. To the extent that anti-Semitism rests on prejudice, a most important step in overcoming it is the breaking down of conventional stereotypes. Such a breakdown ensues when Gentiles become acquainted with Jews as individuals and see them reacting to human situations in understandable human ways, displaying at once a common humanity and the infinite variety of individual reaction which constitutes the divine mystery of human personality. It will be very hard for Gentiles, after reading such a book, to say that the Jews are this or the Jews are that. This book contributes more to an understanding of the Jewish people than volumes of apologetics, because here Jews talk *lefi tummam,* with the candor of persons who are not aware that what they say will be used as evidence.

But more important is the influence of the book on Jews, for whom it was primarily intended and who will, for the greater part, constitute its reading public. The Jew who reads these memoirs will see in their authors something of himself. Their problems are so frequently his own, though he may not react in the same way to them. There is the problem of personal security in a world largely antipathetic to Jews, the struggle for freedom both against environmental factors and against traditional inhibitions, the effort to maintain personal dignity and self-respect in a world that treats Judaism as something of a stigma, the effort at integrating one's own personality notwithstanding the distractions of two contrary cultural traditions, the Jewish and that of the Western world, in which the Jew must share and to which he must adjust himself. These are such typical experiences that the Jewish reader will have no difficulty in seeing, in the authors of these memoirs, people who, despite their diversity, have much in common with himself. They are all of them Jews, all his kin. He will understand them. He will not always find them admirable. Not all of them are the stuff of which heroes, saints and martyrs are made. But, on the whole, he will like them. He will see in their writings "memoirs of my people" and will probably respond to them with the sentiment: Let me "dwell among mine own people."

—Eugene Kohn

Correspondence

A Letter from the New Zionist Organization

Sirs:

Just as is the editorial in THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST of April 2nd, we too are pleased with the statement of Judge Levinthal, President of the Zionist Organization of America, that the New Zionist Organization has no affiliation with the world Zionist Organization or the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and is in no way responsible for the funds of these bodies. We consider a clear distinction between the "old" and the "new" Zionist Organizations both essential and useful to the aims each of them is pursuing. It is quite understandable that Judge Levinthal has no intention to assume any responsibility for the political pronouncements or acts of the NZO. It must be equally manifest that Colonel Mendelsohn, president of the New Zionist Organization of America, rejects any responsibility for the activities of the ZOA. Each of these organizations is an independent body, going its own way and employing its own methods. It will be only to the benefit of Zionism if public opinion is again informed of the true situation.

Wholeheartedly do we share THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST's conviction that this situation of disunity in Zionism, i.e., the existence of two separate Zionist Organizations, is harmful to the Zionist cause. Here, however, ends our unanimity. The conclusions arrived at by THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST are as illogical as they are unjustifiable.

The editorial acknowledges the "good works the New Zionist Organization may have achieved" and is ready to "credit it with having stimulated a wide interest in the problem of a Jewish army for Palestine, and in the plight of European Jewry." It goes even further and says: "We can understand the impatience of the New Zionists with the slow pace of Zionist action in certain directions." Moreover, it acknowledges that "they (the New Zionists) themselves have shown commendable zeal and initiative." The conclusion arrived at by the editorial, therefore, is, to say the least, rather surprising. Says the editorial: "The New Zionist Organization must go back into the (old) World Zionist Organization," where it will possess "freedom of discussion," but will have to "submit to the discipline of the WZO" and to refrain from any political action without permission of the "proper Zionist authorities."

Let us assume that the NZO had followed this well-intentioned advice a few years ago. During these war years, it would have been but a party within the Zionist movement, bound by the "discipline" of the WZO. This means, it would have been unable to inaugurate even one of the good works with which THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST credits the New Zionist Organization. In the course of all these war years, the old Zionist circles categorically disapproved of the "zeal and initiative" of the NZO in stimulating a "wide interest in the problem of a Jewish army and in the plight of European Jewry," which THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST considers so commendable. Submitting themselves to the discipline of an organization, which they condemned as "too ready to whittle down the conception of the Jewish National Home," the New Zionists would simply have liquidated for themselves every possibility to further the advance of Zionism. "The slow pace of Zionist action in certain directions" would have remained undisturbed. These "certain directions" including problems of primary importance such as the Jewish army, the admission of Jews among the United Nations and free immigration into Palestine, would still have been neglected. Would this be in the interests of Zionism?

The New Zionist Organization nourished these "step-children" of the old Zionist policy. And it did it with "commendable zeal." How then can THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST advise individual Zionists as well as Zionist organizations to "refrain from contributing to New Zionist funds" to finance those activities, which THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST itself praises as "good work" and which are neglected by the old Zionist Organization or conducted at a "slow pace"? Surely there is here a striking inconsistency no less than a grave injustice.

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST reminds us that the World Zionist Organization has changed its attitude on political questions and is "today committed to the policy of the Biltmore resolution, which calls for free Jewish immigration into Palestine and a Jewish Commonwealth after the war." This probably means, as Judge Levinthal himself confessed, that the Old Zionists have accepted "Jabotinsky's Zionist program." As a matter of fact, we are a bit skeptical of new resolutions backed by the same old leaders. It is our contention that men who have been for decades engaged in passionate denial and in hateful combat of every idea and every demand of Jabotinsky's state Zionism are organically unable to carry out these ideas and demands, even if they are beautifully inscribed in the best resolution scrolls. "Clothes do not make the man"; neither do resolutions make policies. THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST may believe in miracles. We do not. We are, however, prepared to accord the old leaders of the new policy the

benefit of the doubt and await their deeds. Thus far, nothing has occurred to substantiate these hopes.

If the ZOA had really accepted the basic principles of Jabotinsky's Zionism, its first move should have been to approach Jabotinsky's ideological heirs and to seek Zionist unity based not upon mechanic "discipline" but upon a uniformity of thought and action. We know of no such move. All efforts to establish a united Zionist front made by Jabotinsky and his followers have been systematically cold-shouldered and frustrated by the old Zionist leadership. Indeed, an agreement concluded a year ago between the old and the New Zionist Organization in South Africa was rejected by the World Zionist Organization.

Unity is still a beautiful dream in the Zionist movement. The way to create this unity leads, however, not through the arbitrary "discipline" applied by a bankrupt old leadership over a dynamic movement which is full of "commendable zeal and initiative." When used to direct a concerted action, discipline is a great power; but it can be extremely harmful if used solely to strangle initiative and resourcefulness. The right way is that which Jabotinsky advocated for years, up to the very day of his premature demise: a Round Table Conference of the two Zionist Organizations enunciating the fundaments of a common program and a common leadership.

The New Zionist Organization of America

Samuel L. Katz,

Member of Executive

We fail to see any error in logic or inconsistency in our position. If unity in Zionism is desirable, as our correspondent admits, the zeal of a particular minority for a particular aspect of the Zionist cause which it deems neglected does not warrant secession. It is a non-sequitur to say that, since we deem the zeal of the New Zionist Organization for the Jewish Army commendable and can "understand" its impatience with the slow progress of Zionism, we must approve of its secession. So far, the zeal of the New Zionist Organization has achieved no more than the caution of the Old, and to "understand impatience" does not mean to approve petulance. It may well be that, had the zeal of the New Zionist Organization membership been harnessed to the caution of the old, more would have been accomplished than actually has been achieved. At any rate we still believe in democracy and the rule of the majority on all issues that affect the welfare of the people as a whole.

Editors.

Objections to Our Criticism of Congress

Sirs:

As a friend and reader of The Reconstructionist I feel impelled to write you concerning your editorial in the April 30, 1943 issue entitled "Vicious Class Legislation."

It is disturbing to find an article of this tone in your booklet. I am not affected personally by the subject matter of that article, and although I happen to disagree with its contents, I do not desire to make that fact the point of this letter. My objection to the article is based on its tone wherein you refer to an act of Congress as "one of the most vicious bits of class legislation of which any parliamentary body has been guilty in recent times" and as a "disreputable political trick." Other like phrases are "glaring inequity and arbitrariness" and "shameless catering of Congress to the interests of the wealthy." This sort of language, when devoted to a subject which to my mind is not within your particular field of knowledge, is not appropriate.

There happen to be two sides to the question which you discuss. You do not mention that the purpose of the 1942 Act of Congress was to stabilize wages and salaries and not to reduce then existing rates of compensation. My recollection is that this statement was made in Congress by a member speaking for the Executive branch of the Government in order to induce Congress to place in the statute the language which Congress has now deleted. Notwithstanding that representation, the President immediately thereafter issued his Executive Order limiting salaries to $25,000 net. I believe this was contrary to the Congressional intent.

I agree with you that it is unfortunate that the repealing provision was affixed as a rider to an important money measure. If you had limited your objection to that point it might be understandable. Or, if you had taken the position that all incomes should be limited to $25,000 net, whether earned or unearned, (which Congress had shown an unwillingness to do), that might be understandable. But where you apply such vicious language to a subject of which the merits can properly be debated, I feel you are over-stepping the bonds of useful service.

In the past I felt that where similar language was used in connection with Jewish affairs, the same must be warranted by virtue of your familiarity with the subject. Seeing such language applied to a subject with which I believe you do not have the same familiarity leads me to wonder.

Incidentally, I too happen to be a believer in the President's broad social policies, but I do not feel that support thereof requires an article such as you have printed.

Ira D. Wallach.

EASING THE BAN ON ORIENTALS

(*Continued from Page* 5)

exclusion act, in direct conflict with previously existing treaties with that country. This stimulated the increased immigration of Japanese, but Japanese, too, came under the exclusion ban with the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act.

In 1940 the Chinese in Continental United States numbered 77,504. Of this number, 40,262 (51.9 percent) were native-born citizens and 37,242 (48.1 percent) were aliens.

In 1940 the Japanese in Continental United States numbered 126,947. Of this number, 79,642 (62.7 percent) were native-born citizens of this country and only 47,305 (37.3 percent) were aliens.

What would it really mean if the Chinese and Japanese would be admitted to this country on the same terms and would be given the same rights and privileges granted to all other immigrants? The number of Japanese in this country in 1890 amounted to 2,039 and of Chinese to 107,488. Applying the Quota Law to these two groups, it would mean that each year no more than 41 Japanese could be admitted (at most 100), and no more than 2,150 Chinese.

How insignificant a number as compared with 130 millions of acceptable White folk already in this country!

What a magnificent gesture our democracy could make to underscore the fact that our basic democratic principles really mean what they say! What finer demonstration could we have that the tomorrows will be different from the yesterdays?

We make no defense for the Quota Law which is an unjust and unrealistic piece of legislation. But, taking it for what it is, there is nothing in our Constitution or our Bill of Rights to give any justification for our past practice of excluding Orientals.

It is good to see that various religious bodies are taking a determined stand on this issue. Last week the Reverend Dr. Lloyd F. Whorley of Stamford, Conn., was appointed by Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the New York Methodist area to represent the New York East Methodist Conference at coming public hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in Washington.

It is hoped that all religious and many secular groups will likewise press their arguments for bringing our practices on immigration policy, as these apply to Orientals, in line with the principles and the ideals of our democratic society.

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 7)

several commissions and Dr. Heller's evaluation of their work.

▼

The Jewish Education Committee of New York has arranged for courses to promote the educational use of Jewish arts and crafts in Jewish summer camps. The summer weather and the desire of campers for a program of physical activities, mainly conducted out of doors, are not conducive to any intensive study. This does not mean, however, that camp programs need to be devoid of activities that can make important contributions to the Jewish education of the campers. Many projects which the brief hours and limited physical facilities of most Hebrew schools crowd out of the school curriculum can find a place in the program of the summer camp, and a welcome place at that. The handicrafts have been largely employed in camps in producing artistic versions of Indian lore. They can be more advantageously employed, from a Jewish viewpoint, in producing Jewish creative art. That is why the interest taken in the problem by the Jewish Education Committee is to be highly commended.